

SPEECH

1594

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS R. WRIGHT,
OF GEORGIA,

116

ON THE

DISTRIBUTION OF THE PUBLIC LANDS;

DELIVERED

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FEBRUARY 2, 1859..

WASHINGTON:
PRINTED AT THE CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE OFFICE.
1859.

RECEIVED

HON. AUGUSTUS R. WRIGHT

OF GEORGIA

DISTRICT OF THE PUBLIC LANDS

RECEIVED

IN THE YEAR OF OUR LORD ONE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY

AT WASHINGTON
JANUARY 1877

S P E E C H.

The House being in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union—

Mr. WRIGHT said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Government of the United States owns about a thousand million acres of land. A large proportion of that amount is fit for cultivation. Vast regions of it are immensely fertile. That which is not fit for cultivation, is of value for grazing, timber, minerals, and other purposes. What shall the Government do with this land? This is a great question. It is one eminently practical. The duty of its solution is upon us. Let us settle it like practical men. Let us bring to the discharge of the duty, common sense. Let us endeavor to determine it upon the principles of a correct and matured judgment. Upon so great, so vital a question, let the national Legislature be honest; let us put on "the whole armor" of statesmen, and "quit ourselves like men."

Shall the Government keep it forever, or part with it? The first proposition has no advocates. Part with it she must. Shall she sell it, or give it away? It must go one way or the other; and it must go to persons natural or artificial—to individuals or corporations. I believe, and shall endeavor to maintain, that it ought to be given, as a general rule, to individuals; and not to individuals generally, but to individual citizens who will settle and work it; not to the rich, nor yet to the lazy and vagrant, but to the man of labor.

How say some of the opponents of such a measure, that it savors of the demagogue? we but demand the rights of industry. To create distrust in the fidelity of its friends, is a stratagem of its adversaries. So was it "in the days of the prophets;" the false accused the true. So will it ever be while the struggle continues between truth and error. Truth reasons; error taunts and derides. The "simple ones" only are beguiled by the latter. "Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?" "By their fruits ye shall know them." "Beware of dogs," was the injunction of the Nazarene to his disciples. It was because they

"would make greivous havoc of the flock." Look at the condition of earth's laboring millions. Are there any "dogs" among politicians? Would this measure make "havoc" of the masses? I have few sympathies for the rich; they need none. Capital never fails to take care of itself. I have quite as few for willful vagrancy. "If a man will not work, neither shall he eat," is inspiration. Our sympathies should be with those that work, and with those that would work if they could; especially with the latter—and how many are there even in this country? Of those that work the soil, how many till it for others, obtaining a bare subsistence for themselves?

God never intended that "briars and thorns" should grow where there was a man to plant "fig trees and olives;" nor wild flowers bloom where there was one to sow "wheat and barley." Any contrivance of men, by Governments or corporations, whereby those who would labor are prevented from laboring, is, to that extent, a mischievous contrivance. Look at England; thirty millions population, and thirty thousand real-estate owners. Behold Ireland! think of their pauperism and shudder! "My lord" owns the soil, and keeps it for game. The peasant starves for want of a place to plant the necessaries of life. Men and Governments should study the indications of the Divine mind, and be governed thereby in all their actions. They should study them in nature, in providence, in His word. There can be no permanent prosperity in any other path than in obedience to Him.

It has been asserted as a rule, that man may use his property as he pleases. The rule is correct, with the restriction, however, that he must so use it as not to injure his neighbor, nor the State or kingdom of which he is a citizen. The highest equity recognizes this limitation. Our courts grant injunctions upon it. A man may not engross the market. He may not own above a given amount of bank stock. Upon what principle is it that corporations, classes, or Governments, may monopolize a country's land? I might

ask, upon what principle is it that individuals may do it, to an unlimited extent? This, however, is no issue now, nor likely to be in our day, in this country. I propose to argue only practical questions. Let us recur to the question, upon what principle is it that whole tracts of fertile soil may be locked up for years in non-production, when labor is demanding the free use of its power in production? When, with its use, it would supply its own wants, next those of its community, next of its nation, and then of the world.

Monopolies in personalty, are unlike monopolies in lands. They first work out their own remedy in their transitory and fading nature. They compel distribution at prices, frequently, below a fair value. Meats, grains, dry goods, food of every description, cattle, and stock, may be aggregated and monopolized. The expense of keeping them, as well as their perishable nature, will compel distribution. But if it did not, still monopolies of them would be less injurious than of land. Their aggregation and monopoly does not prevent new productions. If they should draw enormous profits, new creations are going on to supply new wants. Labor may continue to produce. The necessities of life, its comforts and luxuries, spring from the ground and distil from "the morning cloud."

It is very different in the exclusion of our race from the soil. Agriculture is the foundation of all production absolutely necessary for the use or comfort of man. He must eat and be clothed, to live, to think, to modify matter into ten thousand forms for his use. By locking up the soil, you dry up the fountain of life and being.

The proposition was advanced that Governments as well as individuals, should study the indications of the Divine will. A homestead bill, so far from being the invention of a demagogue's brain, is the conception of the Divine mind. The only one we read of in the history of the past, is that ordained by God for the Hebrew people.

When He chose the race of Abraham "out of all the nations of the earth," to be the model nation in the past, as it is to be in the future, and in it to bless all other nations, it was meet that He should instruct it; that He should give it understanding; that He should not leave it to its own wisdom. He did instruct it in religion, in government, in the great law of right and wrong. From the place where "the sight of the glory of the Lord was like devouring fire upon the top of the mount," he spake to it. He gave it three great laws: the law of sin, that is, the law which defined sin, contained in the ten commandments; the law of civil government, like our own, founded in all its great features of civil and criminal jurisprudence, upon the first law; and thirdly, the law of its religion, or, to speak more accurately, the ceremonies of its worship. The law of right and wrong, as contained in the first, all civilized and enlightened nations have recognized as correct, as in accordance with the individual and social necessities of our race, by founding their governments upon it. In the second great law of the Hebrews, that is, their civil law, there

were doubtless many things peculiar from their situation, their locality, the climate, and the manners and customs of the people by whom they were surrounded; but, in the great features of their civil and criminal jurisprudence, it is doubted by the profoundest theologians and most philosophic statesmen whether they have ever been surpassed.

In human government, it establishes "an eye for an eye," "a tooth for a tooth," "life for life." To the latter we still adhere. He who deliberately takes life, of him life is required. Would it not also be well to require of him who deliberately takes an eye, to give his eye? Of one thing there can be no doubt among Christian statesmen: that for that people, under all the circumstances, it was the perfection of government; to suppose less, would be to argue imperfection in the Divine contrivance.

In establishing the Hebrew government, he made it its fundamental duty to provide land for the people; not for the king only, and the nobility, its elders, its princes, and its rulers, but for all the people. When "two of the tribes stopped on this side Jordan," they were compelled to leave "their wives, their little ones, and their cattle," and to pass over armed, all the mighty men of valor, "and help them until they possessed the land."

Let us analyze this a little. There were twelve tribes—one of them divided into two. The united tribes were to provide land for each tribe. It was divided first among the tribes, by lot, and again subdivided, until every man in the commonwealth had a settlement of land. It was to be inalienable. In no event could he deprive himself and his family of his inheritance. If he sold, he only sold the profits till the year of jubilee—that is, the fiftieth year. For on the tenth day of the seventh month of that year, the trumpet did "sound throughout the land," and home, with all its endearments, came back once more to the sons of labor. Its flowers and its fruits; its pastures and brooks; its vines, and its olive trees, endeared by a thousand memories, were possessed by their ancient owners. So careful was the government to provide the people with land, and to keep them so provided, that the women, in their marriages, were compelled to confine themselves to their tribes. In the subdivisions of the realty among the heirs, it would come to pass at last, that the divisions would be too small; and though there is no express provision for this, the whole spirit of their institutions would seem to indicate the duty of the government to provide new settlements. We have examples to this effect.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. THAYER] said, last session, that they were becoming crowded in the ancient home of the Pilgrims. Be it so. If my analogy be a good one, let them "possess another land." If they cannot do it by themselves, "our men of valor" "will leave their wives, their little ones, and their cattle," and "go over armed before them." The command to the Hebrews to take the land of the heathen, "to drive out the Hittite and the Perizzite," was scarcely more obligatory, though is-

sued from the Shekinah between the cherubim, than are the indications of Divine will that we should possess the land of the heathen on our southern border. Look at it, drenched in blood, without law or order, among the fairest portions of creation; the land of perpetual summer; like that of God's chosen people, "a good land; a land of brooks of water, of fountains and depths that spring out of valleys and hills; a land of wheat and barley and vines and fig trees and pomegranates; a land of olive, oil, and honey." Is not the command almost audible, "go ye, and possess the land?"

Under this agricultural law, this ancient people lived; and while they observed it, and kept up the forms of good government as given to them, their prosperity was unparalleled among the nations of earth. The land did "flow with milk and honey," and all her "hills did drop new wine." Green and plenteous were her pastures, and right beautiful her "gardens of olives." "Cattle were scattered upon a thousand hills." "Strong bulls of Bashan" were exhibited in her fairs. Fat "rams of Neboith," and kids from "Kedar's flocks," were sold in the shambles, and "shepherds kept their folds on Judah's hills." "Jerusalem was the perfection of beauty," and the "joy of the whole earth." The daily provision of her prince was "fat oxen out of the pasture, and sheep, and harts, and roebucks, and fallow deer, and fatted fowl." He spake "three thousand proverbs, and his songs were a thousand and five." "The navy of Hiram brought gold from Ophir, and almug trees and precious stones into the land." Sheba's Queen, beholding the land, its riches, its beauties, its glories, and its people, did say, "happy are thy men, and happy are these thy servants." "The songs of the prince were a thousand and five." Did he not have cause to sing? Who of earth's monarchs possesses such a land? and of which can it be said, "happy are thy men?"

If such prosperity was the result of the landed system in the Israelitish commonwealth, would it be unreasonable to hope for similar results from the experiment in this country? Would its support justly subject its advocates to the charge of visionaries or enthusiasts? If they are, it is in an effort to copy the inspiration of the Divine mind. If their conclusions be false, because of their enthusiasm; they ought to be forgiven. Its fire was caught from the realms of light. In its operation, we behold the beneficence of the infinite mind in the extinction of man's last want, and the reproduction of earth's primeval glory.

Were our national Legislature constantly to provide every man with a "plat of land," and as constantly protect him in its enjoyment and its development, whilst the other nations of the world pursue their present policies of monopolies in governments and "noble blood," a spirit from the land of light would fail in an effort to paint the contrast in perfection in half a century. From Vermont's green hills to the "land of flowers;" from the sea-gull's home in the Atlantic to where he dips his snow-white wing in the Pacific; from the rich cañons of the Rocky Mountains, deep

buried in their base, "all round, every way," you would behold the joy-lit faces of boys and girls, of old men and women, millions of cottages of happy freemen, untold fields of living verdure, rivers and lakes filled with steamers, rich in freight and richer still in human forms that crowd their decks; trains of merchandise and travel succeeding each other, till the eye wearied in beholding; villages with their church spires and academical cupolas, dotting the landscape like clouds in sunset; cities with their marble palaces lining the shores of both oceans and the great inland seas; harbors crowded with the ships of the world, their commingled colors floating from their mast-heads; above all, though unseen to mortal eye, a realm of virtuous intellect, loving its country and adoring its God.

Let us leave this picture, however truthful, and inquire what has been, and what is now, the policy of the nations of the world relative to their lands? So far as I have been able to ascertain from history, with the exception already spoken of, to monopolize them in the hands of the Government and of classes. Not going back further than the Christian era, and taking Europe, by far the most civilized portion of the great divisions of the globe, what example does she give us? From a very early date, all through the dark and middle ages, the title of the soil was in the king, the nobility, and the clergy. The occupants were tenants merely, almost uniformly by the rendition of service. This service was sometimes certain, sometimes uncertain; that is, he rendered service so many days, or as long as his lord required him. This service was, most generally, of a military nature. He followed his lord to war, or went at his command. The Church monopolized immense tracts, and let it out by tenures, not so favorable generally as the nobility. The temporal rule of the clergy has always been more oppressive than that of laymen. Of all inconceivably hateful governments, that which oppresses in the name of God is the most detestable. At this present time, the nobility and the Church own the great body of the real estate of Europe. The laboring classes are tenants merely, liable to be removed at the end of their terms, frequently at the will of the landlord. The tenant is so charged, in way of rent, that all the cream of his toil goes to the owner. He can make no permanent provision for himself or his family for the future. Every vine and fruit tree is his lord's, temporal or spiritual. He cannot promise himself that he or his offspring shall eat of the fruit thereof. Every flower that the hand of simple taste and beauty may plant, become for another. The repairs of the cottage, useful or ornamental, is another's pride or gain. The joys of home are darkened by the uncertainty of the future; and the very sports of childhood subdued and saddened by the fear of a trespass upon the rights of the lord.

From the formation of government to the present time, "the elders of the church" and "the rulers of the land" have been in combination to oppress the laboring classes. "The poor shall not always sigh, nor the oppressed go unavenged." "The

meek shall inherit the earth." Here is the good man's "faith and patience." Even in this country, a vast majority of those who till the soil have neither title or inheritance therein. So far from having an inheritance inalienable either by debt or contract, they have none at all. My home is in the rural districts of northwestern Georgia, in as rich, as beautiful, and as happy a land as there is in the world. The blue lime-stone lands are of exhaustless fertility; her mountains, covered with oaks and cedars, like Bashan and Lebanon; her fountains cool, crystal, and perennial; her valleys, landscapes of perpetual verdure. There is but one thing wanting to make it the glory of all lands, and that is that the title and the inheritance should be in the tenants of the soil. Though by no means universal, large portions of it are monopolized and let out to renters. Their humble and temporary dwellings are filled with women and children. Though happy, as they always are, there is nevertheless the shadow of sorrow, like summer clouds, upon the landscape; they know not where they shall dwell another year. "They are strangers and pilgrims in the world." Let Government give them land. They will go to it. If they will work another's, you may be sure they will work their own. It is objected, however, that this would cheapen lands in the older States. This is doubtful. It might prevent any very material advancement in price. It will be difficult to prove that anybody would be damaged by this. But admit the objection; is that an adequate reason for a refusal to give? My property consists mainly in real estate in the hands of renters. If its price can only be maintained at the expense of the sweat of labor, and the ties and joys of the home of the poor, from the depths of the soul do I say, let it be reduced. It is unjust to compel a state of vassalage in the common people to maintain monopolies of the soil. The earth is God's gift to man; as much so as life. It is the duty of the Government to protect him in both—to charge him for neither.

Our Government is certainly in advance of those of Europe on this subject. Land here is inheritable in the common classes, and is sold at greatly reduced prices. But still, even here, as a rule, those who cultivate, do not own the soil. The Government owns land enough to give every man who will work, "a parcel of ground," and scarcely miss it from the public domain. Were it otherwise, and she had no land for her laboring classes, it would be her duty to provide it.

What has been the practice of this Government with regard to her public lands? This is a very important question, and should be understood by the people. Shall we continue the practice of the Federal Government, relative to the public domain?

The Government has, heretofore, disposed of her public lands by gift and sale. Her gifts, however, have not been (with the exception of bounty lands to the soldiers) to individuals, but to new States and corporations. Even the bounty lands have fallen into the hands of speculators. Whether this is within the deeds of cession of the old States, is very doubtful, to say the least of it. If Con-

gress can give one million acres of the public domain to a single State, I can see no reason why she may not give the whole of it. If she can give land enough to a single corporation to build a railroad, and have a clear surplus of \$30,000,000 left, I do not see why that surplus might not be increased to \$1,000,000,000. Is this holding the public lands for the "use and benefit" "of all the States, and for no other use or purpose whatever?" Would not a gift to actual settlers from all the States without distinction, be more in accordance with the letter and spirit of the trust?

The gifts to corporations have been usually for the construction of railroads. It has been attempted to be justified upon the ground that it was the best use of it, to develop the country and add to the national wealth. But is the construction of railroads through a wilderness between points, paying, perhaps, five per cent. profit to stockholders, a better development of the country than the subduing of forests, the filling in of a thrifty and enterprising population, the raising of grain and stock, and the production of the necessities and the comforts of life, and the consequent increase of the objects of taxation, as well as population? Railroads give us no increase of population; at least not a per cent. sufficient to be reckoned, and that largely foreign, riotous, and vicious. Abstractly considered, they add nothing to the productive wealth of a country. They may be profitable, and change capital into new hands. They never cleared a field, planted a fruit tree, grew a blade of grass, or raised a bushel of wheat. Incidentally, they may, and do, stimulate production; but they do not produce. They furnish no soldiers and fight no battles. While they add to the convenience of the people and facilitate trade, in many respects, they retard production. They raise the price of lands, and place them out of the hands of labor, and thus lock them up for years, a wilderness, or develop them slowly under a system of tenancy.

The fact that they raise the price of lands, is advanced as a reason why the Government should continue to give to railroad corporations. Is it a dogma of political economy that the high price of lands in the hands of Government is of advantage either to it or to the people? Is it the object of Government to speculate in lands; to obtain at the lowest and sell at the highest price? Is Government a grand corporation with special privileges for money making? In the proper settlement of this great question of the public lands, it would be well for us to fix in our minds what are the purposes of Government. But were it true that it were its duty to get the highest possible price, then a gift to every citizen who would work (and he must settle and improve to obtain) would add more value to the remaining than grants to railroads.

But it is objected to gifts, that Government sells at low prices, and every man can obtain land. This is not so. Labor, without capital, cannot more than live, and clear, and cultivate the soil. Give labor alone the soil improved, and it will do more than live. It will accumulate. Taking lands unimproved, it must have no drawbacks—no, not

a dollar. It needs, besides, health and the blessing of God in clouds and rain. With these, and energy and will, it will succeed. And why not give it? The objection is, it sells but for little. The sum, indeed, is small to the Government—it is large to honest, industrious poverty. To it, it is of great moment.

You desire a revenue. You need one. Raise it out of luxuries. If you cannot get enough, then levy it upon capital. As you value your country's advancement, keep your hands off of labor. Suppose that the sales of the public lands amount to two, or even five million dollars per annum. What is that? It is put up in books: such books. To read one through or die with Asiatic cholera, would be alternatives, from either of which we might well pray, "good Lord deliver us." Or it is put into a "printing job;" or into two or three ornamental porticoes about the public buildings; or it is sent upon missions to the Arabs and Celestials. It goes into the \$80,000,000 expenditure, and sinks like snow in water.

It is the duty of Government to furnish its people with land. According to the constitution of society, title to lands can be originally derived in no other way than through the Government. Individuals may take possession of uncultivated tracts, but Government will not recognize possession only as title. The very nature of Government presupposes dominion over territory and title therein. It passes, by sale or gift, to its citizens. The question, when reduced to its original element, may be said to be: shall Government sell or give to its citizens? The only argument in favor of sale is revenue. Raise that, as before said, out of luxuries and capital. Our untold millions of acres of public lands should be given to labor, as far as its wants require. God made it, and gave it, as He did water, air, and light. He uses Government as the channel of His bounty. Let Her be true to her trust, and put no tariffs upon the bounty of God. At present our lands may be said to be a sort of standing corruption-fund. Politicians make bids with them for the Presidency, and articles of less value. Agents of corporations, lynx-eyed and unscrupulous, lie round the corridors of the Capitol, and infest its galleries. They are numerous as Egypt's vermin, and voracious as her locusts.

It may be said, if it is the duty of Government to furnish labor with the means of production in agriculture, that is with land, is it not equally so in mechanics? Not so. Title to the means of production, in mechanics and other avocations other than agriculture, is not in Government; nor does it, like title to land, necessarily, originally, pass through it. If supplied by government, they would need constantly to be resupplied. They perish with the using. Land improves, or ought to improve. Once furnished, it remains forever, and "becomes a well of life." It increases in capacity and adds to the wealth of individuals and nations. It ought to be a continually swelling tide, bearing on its bosom the necessities and comforts and luxuries of life to toil's exhausted sons.

Agriculture is the basis of all production and

of every modification of matter by human instrumentality. Out of it grow all other avocations, and upon it, as upon the pillars of Hercules, rests the world. Let it prosper, and commerce and every conceivable avocation follow. Let our country be pressed to its utmost capacity of food and clothing, and want will vanish from the world. Open your exhaustless acres, now waste and desolate, to the toil of the husbandman. By it you will create a living fountain of bone and sinew and muscle and mind. Nations may be rich in lands and yet poor in all the elements of true greatness. Trees and streams and hills and valleys never fight battles. The wealth of commerce will buy a "Swiss guard." It will fight while it is paid—no longer. Men that fight without pay and fight on, are those which have an interest in the soil. It is doubtful whether man is capable of a wholly disinterested act in his highest state of moral and intellectual refinement. Admit that he is, no reasonable being will expect him to devote his life to the good of others without reference to himself. No statesman would predicate the action of government upon such a hypothesis. To make a "wall of fire" round about your country, inhabit it with owners of the soil. Man will defend his wife and children, though they be shelterless and in rags. Natural affection will triumph over the want he sees for them in the future; but let the enemy that he fights offer him a home for himself and family, and provision for the future in his own industry; and if he does not turn upon those who demand his services, his arm will be paralyzed. Tell him to fight for his wife and little ones and the home his Government has given him, and a hero, true as steel and stern as death, he will triumph or die. Armies of such men are heroes indeed, in the proper sense of the word; not such as those of the campaigns of the French revolution, who, under war's dread and thrilling strains, and "all her circumstance and pomp of glory," and love of fame, will make or stand successive shocks from daylight till dark, or follow the nodding plumes of a Murat or Ney through the smoke of battle and its commingled warriors, to death; but you will make men like those of our revolutionary struggle. Men who, with no circumstance of pomp, no glory of fame, no hope of a marshal's baton, no star nor coronet, no legion of honor's cross, but soiled and worn and in tattered garments will march and countermarch and suffer and fight, without drum or fife or flag; and not for a day or a week or a year, but for a life-time; whose march can be traced, not from wounds made in battle's fierce struggle, but from naked feet, treading over ice and snow and frozen ground; whose weapons, while "they are carnal," are also "spiritual." They will carry in their bosoms fire as unquenchable as that which "licked up the water" round about the sacrificial altar of Elijah; wills nerved by the impulse of affection, and unconquerable in death. In the very carnage of battle, home and its scenes will triumph over its horrors.

The French soldiery, well clad and shod and armed, after the burning of Moscow, and the hope of victory was gone, in their disastrous retreat

threw away their guns and swords, and lost all discipline. Courage failed when there was nothing but suffering, no hope of martial triumph. They fought for the glory of the empire and the empire's chief, and their own. The men of the Revolution fought with but little hope of glory derived from the triumph of a well-fought field. Their whole military life was one of suffering and retreat, of want, sickness, and lingering death. Humanity dies with composure, perhaps with triumph, when there is an eye to admire, a tongue to praise, a heart to sympathize; but to die "unknelled, uncoffined, and unknown," in the slow torture of protracted suffering, requires principle, high and holy impulse, pure and noble affections.

Give the people land and arms, and you will need no standing army to execute your laws or repel invasion. Prize-fighters and debauched politicians may riot about the cities. When the police becomes insufficient, or infected with the same spirit, we will have a citizen soldiery from the rural districts, that will reduce them to order; they will do it, too, without ravishing the women or sacking the city. In case of invasion, the man who has followed the plow, will follow the flag of his country, and fight, like the Christian works, by faith in God.

A great statesman has said: "Cities are ulcers upon the body-politic." They have been so in all ages of the world. The more modern ones "have neither been bound up nor mollified with ointment." Prize-fighting is worse, in every moral aspect, than the Spanish bull-fights. Spiritual affinities and free-love are no better than the orgies of the worship of Venus. Ovid's art of sensuality is a vast refinement upon modern debaucheries. There were no "model artists" among the ancients. The forced debauch of a Roman citizen, with the wife of Collatinus, through a threat of

infamy more terrible than death, drove a dagger, by her own hand, to her virtuous heart. Lucretias were scarce in Rome; they are not more numerous in modern cities. Assassinations were frequent about the time of Rome's expiring liberty—not more so, perhaps, than in the middle of the nineteenth century. Rome had no controlling agricultural element; we have, and hence our safety. Enlarge it. Give the soil to honest labor; and our rural districts will be to our cities—lost as they may be in virtue and the destruction of moral miasma—what the ocean is to earth's vileness and filth. Here liberty, like her emblematic bird, will find a secure retreat from the licentiousness of the cities. Here, too, will be found liberty's handmaid—virtue. They have walked earth's green plains and verdant hills together. Like Ruth and Naomi, their countries have been the same; and their graves will be together.

Delicious winds from grain-fields and mountain sides invigorate the body; agricultural exercise gives sensitiveness to the delicacy of taste, health and force to all physical enjoyment, and makes sleep "tired nature's sweet restorer." The devout mind hears the voice of its God in every wind; sees him mirrored in the sunset, and beholds his glory in the morning; flocks and lowing herds talk of his mercy; to his ear the commingled voices of the barn-yard are vocal with praise; to his eye there is divine power and grace in every blade of grass, in the flowers of the clover-field, the yellow grain, and the bending stalks. He "works by faith" as he opens the fertile soil with his plow. He casts his seed into the ground that "it may die and bear grain; it may chance of wheat or some other grain;" and catches from it, with the great Apostle of the Gentiles, the inspiration of the resurrection of his own body, and the life of his own spirit.